

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

IRMA MENDEZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

FIESTA DEL NORTE HOME OWNERS
ASSOCIATION, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:15-cv-00314-RCJ-NJK

ORDER

(Docket No. 66)

Pending before the Court is a motion for sanctions filed by Plaintiff, Docket No. 66, which is hereby **DENIED**. As an initial matter, the relief requested by Plaintiff through this motion is not clear to the Court. She asks the Court to order sanctions against Erica Loyd, an attorney for some of the defendants in the case, but fails to identify a type or amount of sanctions.

In addition, the motion is utterly devoid of legal authority or analysis.¹ The body of the motion consists of 5 pages of text entitled “Timeline of Events,” which includes unsupported accusations and speculation as well as nine exhibits, many of which are completely unrelated to the instant case. Further, the motion cites no legal authority. “The failure of a moving party to file points and authorities in support of the motion shall constitute a consent to the denial of the motion.” LR 7-2.

....

¹The Court is aware that Plaintiff is a *pro se* party. Although the Court must construe pleadings liberally in the favor of *pro se* litigants, *pro se* litigants are nonetheless bound by the rules of procedure. *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 54 (9th Cir. 1995).

1 In short, Plaintiff's motion is wholly insufficient to justify any relief, let alone the significant
2 relief of sanctions. "The Court . . . takes very seriously its duty to order relief and sanctions that are
3 based on sound legal authority, [and] are supported by a sufficient evidentiary showing ..." *Taddeo v.*
4 *Am. Invsco Corp.*, 2015 WL 751072, at *1 (D. Nev. Feb. 20, 2015).

5 Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for sanctions, Docket No. 66, is hereby **DENIED**.

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 DATED: November 30, 2015.

8
9
10 
11 NANCY J. KOPPE
12 United States Magistrate Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28